

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-69 were rejected in the present patent application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 20, 24, 25, 47, and 48. Reconsideration and re-examination of pending claims 1-69 is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph**

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 20, 24, 25, 47, and 48 to provide appropriate reference to a first data item.

### **Rejection under 35 USC 102(e)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 24, 25, 47, and 48 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cok (US 6,298,154). In part, the Examiner suggests that the scanner of Cok anticipates the special purpose hardware of the present invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1, 24, and 47 are patentably distinct from Cok in that the special purpose hardware for recognition as claimed is not found in Cok. The scanner of Cok is a standard scanner that uses recognition software to identify characters. As noted in Cok “the textual content can be derived with the use of optical character recognition software 24 in computer 20.” Thus it is clear that not only is the scanner of Cok not special purpose, it also fails to perform any recognition processing operation at all, as that is

done by the software in the computer 20. Because Cok lacks these two claimed elements, Cok does not anticipate the present invention. The dependent claims are allowable as being based on an allowable independent claim.

**Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-15, 20-23, 26-38, 43-46, 49-61, and 66-69 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Cok and Shustorovich (5,542,006). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant contends that even if the combination were suggested and made, the resulting combination would not result in the claimed elements of the present invention. Such combination would still lack the special purpose hardware that performs one or more recognition processing operation as called out, for example, in claim 1. The dependent claims are allowable as being based on an allowable independent claim.

## CONCLUSION

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-69. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 20, 24, 25, 47, and 48. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims in the present patent application in view of the amendments and remarks. Applicant submits that pending claims 1-69 are now in a condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

COUDERT BROTHERS LLP

By

J. D. Harriman II  
Reg. No. 31,967  
(213) 229-2900

Aug 20, 2004